

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action mailed October 16, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(c) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0018913 to Brezak et al. and rejected claims 3 and 6-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brezak et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,381,331 to Kato.

In response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 8, 10-12 and 14-16. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner relies on Brezak as the primary reference in making the above-mentioned rejections. Brezak is a different system than that presently claimed by Applicant. Brezak allows a first server to be a proxy for the client when requesting data from a second server. See paragraphs [0044], [0046], [0048] and [0054]. By way of being a proxy, server 210 forwards client specific information directly to another server such as server 212 or 214. Id.

As can be seen in Applicant's Fig.1, neither server 107 nor 106 acts a proxy for client 102 to request data from the other. The claims, as presently written, support this contention. Specifically, claim 1 includes the language

sending the access information, session rights and authentication to a client, whereby the client presents the access information, session rights and authentication to the first application server to be authorized to receive the desired content from the first application server

As can be seen from this language, it is the client that forwards information to the data providing server and not another server as described in Brezak.

In making the present rejection, the Examiner equates the claimed "third party server" with Brezak's trusted third-party server 206. Brezak also gives examples of what

the trusted third-party server 206 could be that include being a key distribution center (KDC). See paragraph [0040]. Therefore, the Examiner is equating the claimed “third party server” with a KDC. This interpretation conflicts with the claim language because later in claim 1, Applicant recites a KDC as a separate entity from the third party server. Thus, equating Brezak’s trusted third-party server 206 with Applicant’s claimed “third party server” renders Applicant’s later recitation of a “key distribution center” out of the claim and this is improper.

The Examiner also asserts that Brezak teaches “sending the access information, session rights and authentication to a client,” in paragraph [0048]. Brezak does not transmit any information to the client in paragraph [0048]. Instead, Brezak teaches sending client information from trusted third-party server 206 to server 210. The client 202 receives nothing in paragraph [0048]. Indeed, since the purpose of Brezak is to have one server act as a proxy for a client, as previously described, the client would never send this type of information because that responsibility has been delegated to a server.

Claims not specifically mentioned above are allowable due to their dependence on an allowed claim.

CONCLUSION

No additional fees beyond those for a Petition for a One (1) Month Extension are believed due. However, the Office is authorized to charge any additional fees or underpayments of fees (including fees for petitions for extensions of time) under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17 to account number 502117. Any overpayments should be credited to the same account.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application, withdrawal of the rejections made in the last Office Action and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance. The Applicant's representative can be reached at the below telephone number if the Examiner has any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

Rafie Shamsaasef et al.

_____/Benjamin D. Driscoll/_____
Benjamin D. Driscoll
Reg. No. 41,571
Motorola, Inc.
101 Tournament Drive
Horsham, PA 19044
P (215) 323-1840
F (215) 323-1300

____March 13, 2007____
Date